

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/050,195 | 01/16/2002 | Sang-Bom Kang | 5649-912 | 6301 |
| | EXAMINER | | | |
| | - | | IM, JUNGHWA M | |
| RALEIGH, NC 27627 | | · | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2811 | |
| | | | | |
| SHORTENED STATUTOR | Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MO | NTHS | 03/26/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | OH. | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| , | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 10/050,195 | KANG ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Junghwa M. Im | 2811 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinuity will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 De</u> | ecember 2006. | | | | | |
| | action is non-final. | • | | | | |
| | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1.3-7.13.14 and 25-31 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1.3-7.13.14 and 25-31 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | vn from consideration. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | | | | | | |
| | 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 January 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | * | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | • | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | ion No ed in this National Stage | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/2006. | | Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation of "a capacitor disposed on an upper surface of the TiN contact plug opposite the substrate and comprising a lower electrode that contacts an upper surface of the TiN contact plug and an upper surface of the TiN liner layer." It is confusing since the capacitor is formed on the substrate, not opposite the substrate.

Claim 25 recites the limitation of "the capacitor is disposed on an upper surface of the TiN plug opposite the lower conductive layer." It is confusing since the lower conductive layer is a part of the capacitor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

Art Unit: 2811

Claims 1, 3-7, 13, 25-29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 5,672,542), hereinafter Chang in view of Taguwa et al. (US 6,107,190), hereinafter Taguwa and Moise et al. (US 6,534,809), hereinafter Moise.

Regarding claims 1 and 25, insofar as understood Fig.1 of Chang shows a contact plug in an insulating layer 20 having tensile stress (col. 1, lines 53-54), a TiN layer 26 surrounding the plug on contact and having compressive stress (col. 1, lines 32-33) and an ohmic layer 24 between the insulating layer and the TiN layer.

Chang discloses substantially the entire claimed device except a TiN plug. Taguwa teaches a TiN plug having a tensile stress (col. 2, lines 33-39) in lieu of W plug of Chang. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form a TiN plug in the device of Chang with Taguwa's teaching in order to reduced a production cost as taught in column 1, lines 57-61 of Taguwa.

The device with the teachings of Chang and Taguwa fails to show that a lower electrode of the capacitor structure contacting the upper surface of the TiN plug. Fig.1 of Moise shows a bottom electrode 124 of a capacitor 125 formed on a TiN contact plug 114 (col. 7, lines 43-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Moise's teaching to the device of Chang and Taguwa in order to fabricate a DRAM array with a charge storage capacitor.

Regarding claim 3, the liner of Chang inherently possesses an amorphous structure since it is deposited by CVD.

Regarding claims 4-5, Fig. 1 of Chang shows an ohmic layer, Ti 24 between the liner and the insulating layer.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Chang/Taguwa/Mori does not explicitly disclose the thickness of the ohmic layer asclaimed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the recited range of the thickness for an ohmic layer to improve the conductivity, since it would have been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only in routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPO 233.

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Chang/Taguwa/Mori does not explicitly show the thickness of the linerlayer as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the recited range of the thickness for an liner layer to enhance the adherence, since it would have been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only in routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claim 13, Fig.1 of Moise shows a capacitor 125 formed on a contact plug 114 and a capacitor with a lower electrode 124 made of Pt (col. 9, lines 27-39).

Regarding claim 26, Taguwa discloses a TiN plug formed by CVD (col.1, lines 57-61).

Regarding claim 27, Chang discloses a TiN layer formed by CVD (col. 3, lines 13-14). In addition, CVD, ALD, CVD AND ALD are a process designation and would thus not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a product. See *In re Thorp*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Regarding claim 28, Chang discloses a TiN layer has an amorphous crystal structure since it is deposited by PVC.

Regarding claim 29, Chang discloses a TiN liner formed by physical vapor deposition

Art Unit: 2811

(col. 3, line 13). In addition, IPVD is a process designation and would thus not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a product. See *In re Thorp*, 227 USPO 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Regarding claim 31, Moise shows the upper conductive layer made of Pt (col.9, lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 32, Moise shows the upper conductive layer (51) comprising a lower electrode of a capacitor (col. 9, lines 27-29).

Claims 14 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Mori and Taguwa applied to claims 1 and 25 further in view of Nagasaka et al. (US 6,300,683), hereinafter Nagasaka.

Regarding claims 14 and 30, the combination of Chang/Mori/Taguwa discloses most aspects of the instant invention except a shape of the contact plug. However, Fig. 19D of Nagasaka shows a tapered contact plug 12.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form a tapered contact plug of Chang/Mori/taguwa with Nagasaka's teaching in order to form the plug without cracks. It is well known in the art that it is easier to fill contact/plug openings with tapered sidewalls.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2811

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junghwa M. Im whose telephone number is (571) 272-1655. The examiner can normally be reached on MON.-FRI. 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard T. Elms can be reached on (571) 272-1869. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit 2811

jmi